G. R. S. 59]

GPD—15 000 20 12 1.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

19D/-02

(Muzrai)

File No. 50

Serial Nos. 1—8

Papers Filed.

Month December 1903.

SUBJECT.

File relating to the order rejecting for reasons stated, the appeal petition of Thirumalayya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere Village, Kunigal Taluk in the matter of the punjarihak of the Sri Channigaraya Swamy Temple at Gowdagere Village, Kunigal Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES.

1896, [illegible]

with who

ago,

Note.

petition no 948 dated 1st December 1899,

from Sivanalayya and Venkatamma

of Gowdagere village in Kunigal

Taluk appealing against the order

of the Dy. Commr of the Tumkur Dt.

in re the Puja Huk in the Chunniga-

rayaswami Temple at the said

Village:

Award.

The Dy. Comm'rs letter no 847,5

dated 26th March 1901 submitting

the Records connected herewith

The Chunigarayaswami Temple at-

Gowdagere is a mugani Institution

with Inam lands.

On the 5th August 1896, Timmiah,
of the Pujaris of the said temple, presented
a miscellaneous petition (with one ~~sch~~ annexa
thereto affixed) to the Amildar,
stating that he had adopted one Thimmiah
Ramaiah's son
since that time
about 16 or 18 years ago & that he had been
living with him and during the Puja during
therefore that on account of his old age
of his turn, and praying the name
of the adopted son might be registered
as Pujari and he be allowed to look after the
work. The Amildar held a local enquiry
and reported to the Deputy Commissioner as follows. —

X. Report No 208 dated 31st Oct 1898.

"It is reported that Thimmappa,
Pujari of the Chennigarayaswami temple
at Gundagere, died about 3 or 4
months ago. He presented a petition
on

since died on 7th August 1896, leaving
Head-man Ranganah's son Thimmiah, who
was adopted by him 18 years ago,
might be appointed in his stead.
On enquiry, the Patil and the
Shanbhoges of the village have deposed
to the genuineness of the adoption.
Bukkawwa Venkatamma, wife of
Kondayya, brother of the deceased,
and another Pujari Tirumalayya
contend that he, deposed had
neither wife nor children, that
he did not adopt Ranganah's son
Thimmiah as alleged, and that
they were the proper claimants for the
Puja Hak of the deceased. As this
is a dispute regarding Hak, it
cannot be disposed of summarily.
It is reported that, after the

cc

death of Thimmiah, his sister-in-law (to the village) Venkatamma came and begged to have the puja performed by her grandson (daughter's son) boy of 6 years old and it seems the so-called adopted son Thimmiah was also doing puja once-after another on the same day — A petition was received on the 20th July 1898 that some one had displaced the idol and that it was lying in the temple; but, on enquiry, it could not be ascertained who the perpetrators were. The Pujaris have agreed to bear the cost of reconsecration which is estimated at Rs 100/-. As there is now a dispute between the pujaris regarding their Hak, they do not seem to

cc undertake the work of the puja is not being conducted since the displacement of the idol. The villagers are very anxious to see the puja resumed, and for this purpose, they have decided to subscribe the amounts required for the reconsecration ceremony and appoint a separate man for puja, and that when the dispute of the present pujaris is finally settled, they might take up the work again, paying their proportionate share of the cost of the consecration ceremony.

This temple is endowed with lands (22 A - 16 P) with a gross income of Rs 5-5-9; and it is reported that Sivanandappa was enjoying 3 A - 3.2 P and performing puja, for 2 months in the year (Chaitra & Ashweeja), the

"remaining lands, standing enjoyed by the deceased Thimmayya and he performing puja for the other 10 months. The said Timmaiyya and Venkatamma have now come forward claiming half the share .....

..... The Pujaris might be informed to have their dispute settled in a Competent Court and orders might be issued allowing the villagers to carry out the Consecration ceremony &c".

The above report of the Amildar was submitted by the Asst Comr to the Dy Comr, who sent for the original deed of adoption and finally wrote the following Yadi to the former. —

⊕ Yadi No 103 dated 19-7-99

"As this temple is a Mugani Institn, there is no necessity to ask either the

X now in the file.

Consent or opinion of the villagers regarding its affairs. It is clear from the records that there were 2 Pujaries to this temple viz, Thimmiah and Timmalayya, of whom the former during puja for 10 months and the latter 2 months in the year, and each enjoying his proportionate share of the Inam lands and paying Jodi to Government. Of the two, Thimmiah is dead and Thimmiah, (Ranajiah's son) says that he is the adopted son of the deceased. He has also produced the deed of adoption, which has been duly registered. And the Shanbhogue has also given his deposition to the effect that it is

genuine. Under these circumstances,
the name of Thimmiah, adopted
son of the deceased Thimmiah,
might
~~may~~ be registered in the Barnward
and he be allowed to do puja
for 10 months as ~~was doing~~
the deceased was doing. The Inam
lands which were in the enjoyment of
the deceased Thimmiah, might
~~may~~ also
be given possession of to this Thimmiah.

Venkatamma, Kunnigga's wife
might
~~may~~ be informed by means of a written
notice that she should have ~~has~~ if she has any right in the Archakshik,
it established by means of a regular suit.
~~she has already, if she has~~
and that she should not interfere with
~~with~~ the puja in the temple.

It is the fault of the villagers
to have given rooms for the idol

idol to be displaced owing to avoided-

the dispute between the Pujaris'

Arbitrators should at once

be appointed to have the idol re-

consecrated. And, as Thimmiah

and Timmalayya have each agreed

to, bear the cost of consecration

proportionate

according viz $\frac{5}{6}$ and $\frac{1}{6}$ respectively,

the amount might be collected

from them.

It has also been brought to

the notice that the temple is in a state

of disrepair. An estimate for

its repairs was should be prepared

and the work carried out by

the villagers".

It was against the foregoing order

Timmalayya and Venkatamma have

appeared by Government through their

Advocate Mr. D. Venkatramanayya.

Appeal grounds are set forth in the

appeal petition, which is in English.

About 2½ years ago, a petition had been X. No 649 dated

20th October 1898

received in this office from Kunhigowda and

others, bringing to notice that the principal idol

in this temple had been removed from the temple.

This petition was forwarded by Hyr Dy Comr

for enquiry and report. He reported in

his letter No: 54 dated 22nd July 1899 that

the allegations contained in the petition that the

principal idol in the temple had been displaced

and that the Puja therein has discontinued were

true, owing to dispute between the Pujaries, and

that the idol would be restored to its position

at the cost of the Pujaries Thimmayya and

Timmalayya who had agreed to bear it in

proportion

to the extent ~~of~~ of their ~~their~~ to the Sujawal Office, viz $\frac{5}{6}$ths and $\frac{1}{6}$th respectively.

It is ~~this~~ this letter that the Dy Comr alludes to in his Communication now under reply.

Submitted
RS
15/5/07

Subd to the Dewan

The present Appellants have to bring a regular suit on proper Stamp (10 Rs) before the proper Courts, viz the Munsif and the Dy Comr

RS
3/6/07

The order appealed against is correct. The fact of adoption was alleged by the deceased Munsha & was enquired into by the Panchayet (the deed of adoption which is a registered document & the finding of which has been proved by the Shanbhog Mr. Venkatramma has also been stated & the Panchayet is the proper one of the kind & two men there Mr. Yda. The appellants appointed

Note Continued :—

The Dewan's orders recorded thereon were communicated to the Dy Commissioner, in Govt Order no 374 dated 7th September 1901.

Simultaneously, one of the Appellants, has now presented a Review Petition* addressed to Her Highness the Maha-rani-Regent, stating the following grounds :—

i That Shivamurya, uncle of the Appellant, was only 1/4th Share-holder and died childless.

ii Under the impression that his share would

* Order no 1693/535 dated 3rd October 1901.

would devolve eventually
go to the appellant (himself
had clandestinely
living brothers) he got-
a document purported that-
he had adopted Linnuppa
and had it registered
before his death. The adoption
therefore is not true.

iii That the date of
adoption was written long
after the adoption took place
and has not been attested
by respectable witnesses

iv That he is the sole
Karnavar for the Puja and
is entitled to 6 months'
Puja in the year.

Submitted

4/1/02

Subd to the decree.
Nee petn has proceed
no fresh grounds for reviewing
the order already passed
and the applicn may
be rejected. Kis
27.6.02

PD
27.6.02
4753

Yes Mud
18.VII.02

Rect 21st
Draft KR
21/7/02

Endorsement as per above
orders issued to Linnubhat,
Vide no 184 dated 22nd
July 1902.

Note Continued.—

Circumstances have
x
transmitted in an application
for a second
revision of the order made
14th dated 22nd July 1902.
the other proceedings in the petition may
be examined and this
Case decided

x Reg's no 1767/1275 dated 30th December 1902.

— the letter

the Court appeal
and Court expected
and to this effect
it is and the General
and for order
[illegible]

was accordingly informed by
No 2067 dated means of an Endorsement.
4th April 1903. He has submitted a memorial
to His Highness, which was forwarded
to this Office for disposal, with
the Private Secretary's Dis: No 1298
dated 28th October 1903, with
in the meanwhile
a request to report whether the
case was pending in this
Office and if so, what it was likely
to be disposed of. With the approval
of the Dewan, the Private Secretary
in reply
was informed in this Office Dis:
Flag A No 1144 dated 14th November 1903,
that the petitioner's case was
not pending and that it had
been disposed of so far back
as September 1901 and his
last Review petition rejected
in April 1903.

An Endorsement has now
to be given to the memorialist, returning
the

16

the enclosures received with the memorial.

Submitted

Ds
28/11/03

Reply to Petn by Endorsement that his case which was considered by Govt and rejected by Govt more than once, will not now be re-opened. Return the enclosures. DL 6/12/03

06004

Draft Endt to Dawan

Ds
9/12/03

14593
9.12.03

9.12





To

Muzrai Superintendent
Bangalore.

Muzrai Petn no 948/1899-00.

Petitioners

1. Dimmalaiya,
Poojari of Shemnja
Varga Swamy residing
at Gowdgere, Yediyur
Sammat, Kunigal
Taluk.

2. Venkatamma, widow
of Poojari Konaiya,
residing in the same
village.

Vs

Counter-Petitioner

Thimmaiya,
Son of Sethagere
Ranglah, now
residing in the same
village.

The Petitioners above named respectfully beg to prefer an appeal against the order of the Dy Comr of Tumkur, no 103/8. dy 19.7.99 rejecting the Poojari Hak to the following amongst other reasons:—

1. That the Dy Comr assumed the enjoyment of the Poojari Hak by turns of 10 months and 2 months, the 1st limit the

late Thimaya respectively and also the enjoyment of the lands in the same proportion without finding out the relationship existing between the parties.

2 That the Shanbogue and the Patel gave false receipts signed by themselves for receipt of Kan- -dayam in the said proportions for the 5 years prior to the death of Thimaya was clearly established in the Criminal case filed against the Defs before the Taluk Magistrate of Nunigal in Cr L Case No 12 of 1898/99 (An authenticated copy of the Judgt in which the receipt was marked Ext A & discussed, is herewith produced for reference)

3. That the 1st Def is the great grandson of Lakkatapa, the ancestor of the parties, and the deceased Thimma and the husband of the 2nd Def were the grandsons of the said Lakkatapa Thus the

two sons by names Venkatappa and Srinivasaya the immediate ancestors of the parties.

4. That the 1st Defr who represents one branch of the family enjoyed one half of the Huk as also one half of the lands.

5. That the 2nd Defrs' husband Konanja who was the elder brother of the deceased Thimaya enjoyed one-fourth of the Huk, and the deceased Thimaya enjoyed the remaining fourth. Thus these 2 members represented the other branch of the family which enjoyed the half.

6 When the Shanbogue pretended in the Muzavar enquiry that he did not know how the 1st Defr was related to the deceased Thimaya, and when he spoke only to the enjoyment, the Dy Comr erred in placing any reliance upon such a statement when the proof produced was only a receipt granted by himself in

the Seal and Signature of the higher Authorities.

7. That the Dy Comr erred in presuming that the counter Pet has adopted because a registered document was produced.

8. That the Petitioners submit that if the counter Pet establishes his adoption he is entitled only to get one-fourth of the Poojari Hak and also a similar share in the lands attached to the office.

9. That till the counter Pet establishes such right, the Petitioners who are admittedly shareholders are entitled to be in possn of the Hak and their shares of the lands.

10. That the Petitioners submit that they have no objection to the counter Pet enjoying his Hak if he establishes his adoption in a Court of Law.

11. That the Order of the Dy Comr directing a division and enjoyment of the same in the proportion indi

is certainly not warranted by the flimsy nature of the evidence produced before him.

Pending the final orders to be passed on this Petition, the Petitioners pray that the Execution of the order appealed against may be held in abeyance inasmuch as it interferes with the vested rights of the parties without a proper adjudication.

Bangalore
1st December 99

D. Nath & Narasimha Iyer
Advocate for Petrs

No. 580

Memo

The petition is returned as it is insufficiently stamped.

The Appeal has been preferred more than 4 months after the date of the Deputy Commissioner's Order and is thus time-barred.

Bangalore
9th Decr 1899.

By order
A. Sheshagiri Rao
Murrai Secretary

Re-submitted in the affair the deficiency of Stamps and with an affidavit explaining the delay in filing the appeal.

Bangalore
31st Jan 1900

Asst Commr & C
in charge for Secy



ಸ್ಮಾಲ್ ಕಾಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

ನಂಬರು.

ಸ್ಮಾ 189ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ವಾದಿ.

ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ ಮೆ॥ ದೇ. ವೆಂಕಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ,

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮೆ. ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದ
ಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ, ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದ
ತಕ್ಕಬಗ್ಯೂ, ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಶಿಲ್ಕು ವೊಎಲಗೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ವೊಬಲಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಡಸ್ಕ್ರೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗದು
ಕೂಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ; ಸಹಾ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೂದ್ದರಿಂದ, ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ
ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ರುಜು

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು,
ತಾರೀಖು 12ನೇ 189ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರು. ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು
ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೂದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರಟಿಪೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Advocate for

No 743 Exh. 5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

S & L

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying appeal Petition Registered No. 948 dated 18th January 1900 received at the Dewan's Office from Timmaiya, Archak of the Chennagiriraya swami temple at Gowdagere, Kunigal Taluk appealing against the Dy Coms order in re the Panjari hak of the said temple in the said Temple

is forwarded, together with its enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur District for submission of a report of the facts of the case together with the views thereon.

By Order,

Muzrai Secretary.

BANGALORE,
The 20th Jan 1900

Dept.

Sl 3 / 9.1.19

In the Court of Session

Petition

19.01

Sworn before me

this 22nd Jan 1900

Bangalore

J. Narasimhan

CC on magistrate

2.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER & FIRST CLASS MAGISTRATE
BANGALORE

To the Manchester Co.,

MUZRAI

~~189~~ 1901

From ~~The Muzrai Superintendent~~

To The Dy: Commissioner
Tumkur District

Dated 22nd March
Despatched
Received
General No. 1005
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

This office No 743 of
10th January 1900 forwarding
for report and submission
of the records, the appeal
Petition of Tirumalaiya
archak of the Chennagiri-
-rayaswami temple at
Gowdagere, Kunigal
Taluk in re the Pujari
hak in the said temple

—"—

Has the honor to draw
attention to the above
and to request that the
Submission of the

(Gen. Office No. 97)

1900–1. SC 5



From The Dy: Commissioner
Muzrai Depth

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Muzrai Depth.

Dated 26th March 1901.
Despatched 27th
Received

General No. 875 } 1900–1.

Enclosures Number. 1 bill & Pet 2

His memo No: 743 dated 10-1-1900.

Submitting a report on the petition of Thimmalaiya, Archak of the Chennigaraya-swami temple at Gowdagere, Arsikal Taluk

Depr 27/3/01

Deputy Commissioner's
Tumkur District.

No: 875.

Dated 26th March 1901.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Marazrai Department.

Sir,

In reply to your official memorandum no: 743 dated 10th January 1900, calling for report on the petition of Thirumalaiya, Archak of the Chennigarayaswamy Temple at Gowdagere, Kunigal Taluk, appealing against my order in re the Poojari hak in the said temple, I have the honour to invite a reference to my letter no: 54 dated 22nd July 1899 on the subject, and to add that the temple has since been re-paired, and the idol reconsecrated with due ceremony by the Archaks and that the worship is regularly carried on.

2 The file of vernacular records connected with the Pujari hak in question as well as the Petition under report and its enclosures is submitted for reference. The delay in the submission of this report was due to the fact that the repairs of the temple were in progress and completed only lately.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner.

Raashtr

516

Appellants

1. Srinivasayya

2. Venkatamma

Vs

Respondent

Thimmiah.

Read :—

Petition no 948 dated 1st December 1899, from Srinivasayya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal Taluk, appealing against the order of the Dy Commr, Tumkur District, recognizing the ~~respondents~~ right to $\frac{5}{6}$ Hrs share in the pujare hak of the Channigarayaswami Temple, a Muzrai institution in the above village

And the Dy Commrs Letter

No

875 dated 26th March 1904,
from the Dy Commr, Tumkur District,
submitting the records
connected with the case.

The facts of the case
are as follow.—

Thimiah and
Timmalayya were the pujaris
of the Chennigarayaswami
Temple in the Gowdagere
village, Kunigal Taluk.
They were doing puja in the
temple for 10 months and
2 months respectively in the
year, each enjoying his
proportionate share of the
Inam lands and paying
quota to Government.

On the 5th August 1896,
Thimiah presented a
petition

to the Amildar, praying that on the score of his old age, the name of his adopted son Thimmiah might be registered as Pujari and he be allowed to do the work during his term. The said Thimmiah ~~Amildar~~ also produced the registered Deed of Adoption. At the local enquiry held by the Amildar, the genuineness of adoption was proved. In the meanwhile Thimmiah (Registered) died; and ~~on the report of the Amildar~~ on his death the other Pujari Timmalayya and Venkatamma wife of the deceased's brother each claimed

$\frac{1}{2}$ share

in the puja work, on the ground

that Thimmiah had died

childless and that he had

Rangaiah's son
not adopted Thimmiah as

^

alleged. The Amildar

reported the facts and

the result of his enquiry to

the Dy Comr, who ~~decided~~

held that the adoption was

genuine and directed

that the name of Thimmiah -

adopted son of the deceased

Thimmiah - be registered

as pujari and ~~that~~ allowed

to do puja for 10 months in

the year, as the deceased

was doing.

The Attachment continued

that Thimmiah's adoption

was

was not properly established
and that they are the
proper claimants for the
share held by the deceased

~~~~

Hr. 374 Dt 7th Sept 1901
En V/f.

order. —

The order appealed
against is correct. The
fact of adoption was alleged
by the deceased ~~Shimmaggu~~
Shimmaggu and is amply
borne out by the deed of
adoption which is a registered
document and the ~~—~~
genuineness of which has
been proved by the Shanbhogue
The petitioners testimonies
have not been shaken and
~~~~

Other petitioner Sivanalingam is the engineer of the Hulk for two months in the year.

The Appeal is rejected.

(Devan's order) 5/9/01

Dy Controller

Print:

To

The Dy Comr, Tumkur &c-

returning the records.

Send to the parties in terms of the above order.

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 7th September 1901

No. 374

Rejecting, for reasons stated, the appeal petition of Timmalayya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk, in the matter of the pujari *hal* of the Channigarayaswami temple at Gowdagere.

SBP—1. 9-1901—200

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Muzrai, dated 7th September 1901.

READ—

Petition No 948, dated 1st December 1899, from Tirumalaiya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district, recognizing the respondent's right to the share in the pujari *hak* of the Channigarayaswami temple, a Muzrai institution in the above village

AND —

Letter No 875, dated 26th March 1901, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district, submitting the records connected with the case

The facts of the case are as follow —

Thimmaiya and Tirumalaiya were the pujaris of the Channigarayaswami temple in the Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk They were doing *puja* in the temple for ten months and two months, respectively, in the year, each enjoying his proportionate share of the inam lands and paying jodi to Government.

On the 5th August 1896, Thimmaiya presented a petition to the Amildar praying that, on the score of his old age, the name of his adopted son Thimmaiya might be registered as pujari and he be allowed to do the work during his turn The said Thimmaiya also produced the registered Deed of Adoption At the local enquiry held by the Amildar, the genuineness of adoption was proved In the meanwhile Thimmaiya (Registerdar) died, and on his death, the other pujari Tirumalaiya and Venkatamma, wife of the deceased's brother, each claimed ½ share in the puja *hak*, on the ground that Thimmaiya had died heirless and that he had not adopted Rangaiya's son Thimmaiya, as alleged The Amildar reported the fact and the result of his enquiry to the Deputy Commissioner, who held that the adoption was genuine and decided that the name of Thimmaiya, adopted son of the deceased Thimmaiya, be registered as pujari and allowed to do puja for ten months in the year, as the deceased was doing.

The appellants contend that Thimmaiya's adoption was not properly established and that they are the proper claimants for the share held by the deceased.

No. 374, DATED BANGALORE, 7TH SEPTEMBER 1901.

ORDER THEREON—The order appealed against is correct. The fact of adoption was alleged by the deceased Thimmaiya and is amply borne out by the Deed of Adoption, which is a registered document, and the genuineness of which has been proved by the shanbhog. The petitioner Venkatamma has no *locus standi* and the other petitioner Tirumalaiya is the enjoyer of the *hak* for two months in the year.

The appeal is rejected.

Deputy Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the records

End.—H.A.R.

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 7th September 1901

No. 374

Rejecting, for reasons stated, the appeal petition of Timmalaya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk, in the matter of the pujari *hal* of the Channigarayaswami temple at Gowdagere.

SBP—12-9-1901—500

READ—

Petition No. 948, dated 1st December 1899, from Tirumalaiya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district, recognizing the respondent's right to ⅝ths share in the pujari *hak* of the Channigarayaswami temple, a Muzrai institution in the above village.

AND —

Letter No. 875, dated 26th March 1901, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district, submitting the records connected with the case.

The facts of the case are as follow :—

Thimmaiya and Tirumalaiya were the pujaris of the Channigarayaswami temple in the Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk. They were doing *puja* in the temple for ten months and two months, respectively, in the year, each enjoying his proportionate share of the inam lands and paying jodi to Government.

On the 5th August 1896, Thimmaiya presented a petition to the Amildar praying that, on the score of his old age, the name of his adopted son Thimmaiya might be registered as pujari and he be allowed to do the work during his turn. The said Thimmaiya also produced the registered Deed of Adoption. At the local enquiry held by the Amildar, the genuineness of adoption was proved. In the meanwhile Thimmaiya (Registerdar) died ; and on his death, the other pujari Tirumalaiya and Venkatamma, wife of the deceased's brother, each claimed ½ share in the puja *hak*, on the ground that Thimmaiya had died heirless and that he had not adopted Rangaiya's son Thimmaiya, as alleged. The Amildar reported the fact and the result of his enquiry to the Deputy Commissioner, who held that the adoption was genuine and decided that the name of Thimmaiya, adopted son of the deceased Thimmaiya, be registered as pujari and allowed to do puja for ten months in the year, as the deceased was doing.

The appellants contend that Thimmaiya's adoption was not properly established and that they are the proper claimants for the share held by the deceased.

No. 374, DATED BANGALORE, 7TH SEPTEMBER 1901.

ORDER THEREON—The order appealed against is correct. The fact of adoption was alleged by the deceased Thimmaiya and is amply borne out by the Deed of Adoption, which is a registered document, and the genuineness of which has been proved by the shanbhog. The petitioner Venkatamma has no *locus standi* and the other petitioner Tirumalaiya is the enjoyer of the *hak* for two months in the year.

The appeal is rejected.

L. ANANTASAMI RAO,
Deputy Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the records.

Exd.—H.A.R.

Sl 7

Submitted

The Petitioner was one of the Appellants in this Case – The Copy may therefore be granted to him and the Cases of his Appeal Petn may be returned as required for

12/9/07

14/9/07

The Enclosures of the Appeal Petn, have been returned to the Party.

17-9-1907

17/9/1907

No 395 -

Sl 8

OFFICE OF GOVT. OF MYSORE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT,

The 11th Sept. ~~189~~ 1901.

ENDORSEMENT granted to Thimmalayya and Venkatamma of Gowdagere village, Kunigal Taluk (through Advocate Mr. D. Venkataramiah)

in reply to their Petition Registered No. 948 dated 1st December 1899, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District recognizing the Respondent Thimmayya's right to the 5/6ths share in the Pujari hak of the Chennigarayaswami temple in the said village.

Petitioners ~~is~~ are informed that the order of the Deputy Comr. being correct, their appeal is rejected.

By Order,

17/9/1.

Dy ~~Asst.~~ Secretary

Transferred to Muzrai Branch
13-12-01

14/12/01.

1901

No. 1693

Name of Petitioner Tirumalaiah Pujari of Sri Channigarayaswami

Village Gowdagere.

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 25-11-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Fine

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 535
MUZRAI BRANCH

17/12/01

Referred

Submitted

The matter has been disposed of in Govt Order no 374 dated 7th September 1901 The office Note continued & 4/1/02 Submitted

ABSTRACT

Application for review of Govt Proc (Muzrai) No. 374 dated 9-01, on the following grounds:—

That the adoption of Timmaiah is not true and unsatisfactory in as much as there were none to give him in adoption; That the deed recognising the adoption was written long after the adoption took place and has been attested by only two unknown, young

MGCPB—23-3-01—3,000.

and mofussil witnesses;
that it is unjust to give
only 1/6th hak to petr., who
has been the pujari from
time immemorial and
the remaining 5/6th hak
to Timmiah who has
no claim at all, the
former hakdar Timmiah
(Respt.) having died
issueless.

Prays that for the above
reasons and after the per-
-usal of all the records, the
petrs hak may be established
and he declared to be
half hissedar.

Rule 1 Govt: Instr: No.
395 of 11-9-01.
2. Govt: Pro. No. 3748 7-9-01.
3 Dy: Court's order No. 103 of 19-7-99.
4. Judgment in case
No. 12 of 98-99 on the
file of the III class Magis
-trate Kunigal Tk:.
5. Acceptance deed of 5-10-96

Reference
22.1.02

1693 of 1901 – [illegible]
[illegible] 12-12-01 [illegible]

24-1-02

Transferred to Mysore Branch in continuation

25/1/02

[illegible]



No. 2109

Name of Petitioner Virumalayya of Chennigarayaswamy Archaka temple

Village Gowdagere grama

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 13th Jan 1902

Date of Receipt 16-1-02

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

With reference to endorsement No 182 dated 19th Nov 1901 from the Private Secy informing that his Appeal petition regarding the hereditary of Archakaship of Chennigarayaswamy temple, has been forwarded to this office for disposal & that the parties concerned may be present for the enquiry held in their presence & prays that he may be informed of the date of hearing

21/1/02

MGCPB—23-3-01—3,000.

Byrakatte Gowda
16/1/02

2109

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date .....
REG. No. 691
MUZRAI BRANCH

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 2109R
DATE. 16-1-1902

Muz F 50.'01

OFFICE OF GOVT. OF MYSORE,

No. 184 En 5 dy 23/7/02 MUZRAI DEPARTMENT,

& 185. The 22nd July ~~189~~ 1902

ENDORSEMENT granted to Swimmalaiyya, Pujari of Chennigarayaswami temple, Gowdagere village, Kunigal taluk

in reply to his Review Petition Registered No. 535 dated 25th November 1901, praying for a review of the order passed in Govt. No: MZ 374 dated 7th September 1901 rejecting ~~the~~ his appeal regarding the Pujari Hak of the Chennigarayaswami temple.

Petitioner is informed that he has produced no fresh grounds for reviewing the order already passed in Govt. No. MZ 374 dy 7th Sept. 1901, His Review petn is rejected

By Order,

Dewan's order

22/7/02

Dy Muzrai Secretary

Copy to the Dy Commr, Tumkur Dt., for info

R.O.

References

15-3-02

17-3-02

Transferred to Mysore Branch in continuation

18-3-02

19-3-

Please continue the note for orders

12/4/02

Encl: Rec

Please put-up the file with subject for the Note being cont'd.

W. 16.4.02

1902 No. 892.

No. 212

Name of Petitioner Timmalaiya

Village Goreligere

Taluk Hunsur

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 11/02

Date of Receipt 7.3

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2 Mahajars.

ABSTRACT

States that he had submitted a petn praying for review of Govt order regarding the post of Archaka of Hemmigaraya-Swamy's temple

that he had attached two mahajars to prove that the exception was fabricated & not legal

& prays that the said mahajars may be considered along with other records.

HB
15/3

Read with
Mr. Seth Hawes,
The Pinnacle Sees
HH
7.3.02.
, 2 enclos

2612R
7-3-1902

2612



2612/01 ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರಿಗೆ,
ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ 18-3-02 ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ
19-7-02

No. 259

Name of Petitioner Tirumalaiya archak

Village Gowdagere

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 11.6.02

Date of Receipt 23.7.02

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

forwarded to the
Muzrai department

631
31-7-02

1/8/02

Rec'd
12/8/02

ABSTRACT

Memorial to H.H. the Maharaja Regent:-

Re continuation of his previous petitions, which he was informed were forwarded to this office for disposal, submits for perusal the genealogical tree of his family and prays for orders appointing him as archak of Cheenagara Ye swami temple of Gowdagere, Kunigal Sta

Submitted for orders with previous papers

Sd
9/9/02

Orders have been subsequently passed on his petn to H.H.

This may be filed

Sd
20/9/02

MGCPB—4,000—31-1-02


Venkatarayanaiah
(original husband)
Timmaiah
Venkatiah
Timmaiah (petitioner)
Venkatiah
Timmiah (died)
Timmiah (alleged adopted son)
Koniah (died issueless. wife Venkatamma

26.9.08

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 17-9-02
REG. No 178
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದು ಅಂತಿಮವಾಗಿ ಸಿಲಿಂಡರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಳವೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ
ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು ಅಂತಿಮವಾಗಿ ಸಿಲಿಂಡರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಿ

ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

1 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

2 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

3 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

4 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

5 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

6 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

7 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

---

1 ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

No. 525 ఈ 2 తి 17. 9. 02.
Inwrd/F. 50-1901

దొడ్డిగల్లి శిథిల్యాస్థితి యతియుండు
నం మతు శిందిగళి స్త్రీశిందగరం య
స్థామియవర బీఱుద లుశిక్షణశ్రీ కిరుమల్లి
యవూశి

ఫిలుక్కుంచుందిగి శిం శిందిగళి త
శ్రీశ్రీంతమంది మంశిక్షుంళు 17 నే మర్శం
478 నే సంవత్సరం అశ్వీశ్వరాంవత్సరద శ్రవణ
అంతు —

స్త్రీ శిందిగరం య స్థామియవర
బీఱుద లుశిక్షణం శిక్షణ విషయదల్లి
ఫిలుపుంచుంగళిగి కిం వదాంశిగళిల్లి వ
యిళిల్లుల దాంవులోగధ్యస్థిశి, ల్లోదప్పి
లుం లాభిసిందప్పిమశ్రీక్షిం బ్బిరువ
ఈ ఆపం ల్యామంది బిడిగి మర్శం 184 నే
సంవత్సరద లుంతిందర్ స్థిశిం కోయల్లి మీం
దలాంప్పి మంతిసుశ్రీ. నదవిస్థితరు
సంమశ్రీగి లాభ మంది 24 నే శిందిగళిం
ల్లాగింతశిరిశి శవంధియం నిరువదం

ಈ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ
ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು
ಭತ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಆದೇಶ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ
ಅಂದರೆ 1902ನೇ ಜುಲೈ ಮೊದಲನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ
ಪರಿಷ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪರಿಷ್ಕರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ
ವಾರ್ಷಿಕವಾಗಿ ಸುಮಾರು 1,50,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು
ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು
ಹಣಕಾಸು ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಮತಿಯೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

By order,

Draft. 17/7/02

Dy. Secy.

Finance Department.

59 of 1902 in O.S. No. 2000 of 2000
dated 1-8-02 and received
on 9-1-03

one Rupee stamp affd

This is an application
for a second review of this suit
in re pursuja.

Jv
~~Keep this~~ the suit &
the Mysore Department

ad
29-1-03

1902-03

No. 1767

Name of Petitioner Timmaraiya

Village Gowdagere

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 30.12.02

Date of Receipt 9.1.03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Six

ABSTRACT

Writ in reference to
Mysore endt No. 184 dated
23.7.02 and endt No.
525 dated 17.9.02,
Mys. 30.9.
rejecting his review
application in the his
pujari hulk of Channa
-giraya Swami temple,
Gowdagere village,
praying for a second
review of the said
order after examining
certain witnesses
named by him in the petn

MGCPB—5,000—10-11-02

30/1/03

OFFICE 1275



1767 R
9-1-1903

ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಳಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಿಸುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥವು ಯಾವುದು?

ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಕಲ್ಲು

Endorsement granted to Immadayya, Pujari of Chennigarayaswami temple, Gowdagere village, Kunigal Taluk, in reply to his petition Regd no 1275 of 30th December 1902, praying for a second review of the orders passed in Govt. Revn. No 374 dated 7th Sept. 1901 rejecting his appeal regarding the Pujari Hak of the Chennigarayaswami temple

---

No 2067 of 4.4.03.
Mn: F No 50-1901

Petitioner is informed

2068
Mn. F No. 50-01 of 4.4.03 that the orders already passed is final. His

petition for another review

is rejected.

By order

2/4/03

By Secretary

Navy Dept

Revd order

2/4/03

Copy forwarded to

the Dy Comm Immigration,

in continuation of our

no 185 dated 23rd July 02

By

Dy Secy

1767 ಫಸ್ಲಿ 2 ಜೇಷ್ಠ 2 ಶುಕ್ರವಾರ 2 ಘಂ

22-ಗಳಿಗೆ 29-1-030 ಕ್ಷಣ

10-6-03

Transferred to the Mysore Department in continuation

10-6-03

13/6/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 16-6-03
RL 2067 190
MUNICIPAL BRANCH

No. 2898

Name of Petitioner Tirumalaiah

Village Gowdagere

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 8.6.03

Date of Receipt 9.6.03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Prays for return of the enclosures of his petitions submitted on 30.12.02 & 5.1.03 respectively in re the pujari hak of Sri Chennakeshavaswami temple of Gowdagere, as they required by him for submission to H.H. the Maharaja

10/6/03.

By
9-6-03

muzrai stamp
affd

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Muz. 2.] MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

2645 ಈ: 6. ದಿ 30. 6. 1903

ನಂ. Muz: F 50-01

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿ

ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಸುಮಾರ್ ಮಾಹೆ 8 ನೇ

2898

ಮಕ್ಕುಂ 2067 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಆದರೆ 1903 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ನವೆಂಬರ್ ನೇ ಮಕ್ಕುಂ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಕಾ. ಕಿಳಗಂಡುಬರುವುದು.

ಕಳ 30 ನೇ ಸೆಪ್ಟಂಬರ್ 1903

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಧೇಯಕರು

ದಿ 22/9/03

B. O.

Dy Secretary

Muz: Dept.

MGCPB—500—31-8-01



OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated Mysore, 28th October 190 3

A-c. 1298

2 Petns with Encls.
(1 Petn only is read).

Read
31/10/03

Papers
Js

Petition — as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Muzrai Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

~~for~~

The Secretary is requested to report in the mean-time whether the case is pending with him and if so when it is likely to be disposed of.

Reply sent to Private Secy
in No 1144 dated
May 7 50-1904
14th Nov 1903

No.

692 dated 26-10-03.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

Petition No. 692 dated 26th October 1903, from Jivunmaliah of Gowdagere Village in the Kunigal Taluk, received with His Highness the Maharaja's Private Secretary's No. 1298 dated 28th October 1903

Memo

No. 1144 dt 14-11-03

Mar F. 50-1901.

Draft reply to the Private Secretary to H.H. the Maharaja, submitted to the Dewan for appl.

4/11/03

13890/7-11-03

The petitioner Jivunmalaiya is one of the two poojaris of the Channigarayaswami temple at Gowdagere, Kunigal Taluk. He appealed to Govt against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, recognising 5/6th share of the pooja hak of Jivunmaiya, a Co-poojari and 1/6th share of the petitioner, ~~and~~ the Government, having gone fully into the case, upheld the order of the Deputy Commissioner and rejected the appeal in their Roc. No. 3/4 dated 7th September 1901. An Endorsement to that effect was also granted to the appellant on the 11th September 1901. He then addressed two

review petitions which were also rejected and Endorsements Nos 184 & 22.7.02 & 2067 24.4.03 Muz.F.50-01 respectively granted to them.

The petition now received is the 3rd of its kind and this will now be gone into and further orders of Government obtained.

The Petitioner's case is not now pending in this office. It was disposed of so far back as September 1901, and his last Review Petition rejected in April 1903.

9.XI.

"By order"

Deputy Secretary
Muzra Department.

5/11/03

Draft submd
to the Dewan for appl.
9/12/03

No. 1710 Exp. file
Mun. F. No. 50-01

No 1711 *.
Mun. F. No. 50-01
D/12.12.03.

Memorial.

Endorsement granted to Tirumalaiya, Pujari of Chennigarayaswamy temple, Gowdagere village Kunigal taluk, in reply to his Memorial, dated 26th Oct. 1903 to His Highness the Maharaja, praying for revision of the orders passed in Govt. Pro. No. 374 D/7th Sept. 1901 rejecting his appeal regarding the Pujari hak of the temple.

Petr. is informed that his case which was considered by Govt.

and rejected by the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja more than once, will not now be re-opened.

2. The enclosures to the Memorial under reply are herewith ret'd.

By order

8/12/03

Dy Secy
Mun. Deptt.

8/12/03

9 x 11.03

Copy forwarded to the Dy Commr Tumkur District in continuation of Our No 2068 dated 4th April 1903

Mys H 50-01

8/12/03